

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SATISH CHANDER BAHL,

Plaintiff,

v.

CUNARD CRUISE LINE et al.,

Defendants.


Case No. 2:24-cv-08462-SB-RAO

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE
DISMISSAL FOR LACK OF
PROSECUTION

Plaintiff filed this action on October 1, 2024, more than five months ago. After Plaintiff filed defective service documents and failed to establish proof of service by the December 30 deadline, the magistrate judge (to whom the case was then assigned) issued an order to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to effect service or prosecute the action. Dkt. No. 8. In January, Plaintiff filed proof that the summons had been served, but the proofs of service do not mention the complaint, and one of them incorrectly notes service on “Carnival Cruise Line, dba Queen Mary II,” which does not match either the summons or the complaint. Dkt. Nos. 14, 15; *cf.* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(1) (“A summons must be served with a copy of the complaint.”); L.R. 4-6 (“The plaintiff must file a proof of service within 14 days of service of the summons *and complaint* or receipt of a notice and acknowledgement of service.”) (emphasis added). Thus, it is not clear on this record that Defendants have been properly served, and the deadline for service under Rule 4(m) has long passed. Moreover, if service as to either defendant was proper, the answer was due almost a month ago, and Plaintiff has taken no action to pursue entry of default.

Accordingly, Plaintiff is ordered to show cause in writing no later than March 14, 2025 why this case should not be dismissed for lack of proper service or for lack of prosecution. Failure to timely respond will be construed as consent to dismissal of this action without prejudice.

Date: March 6, 2025


Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr.
United States District Judge